U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

Categorical Exclusion DOI-BLM-NV-B010-2018-0027-CX

Grazing Permit Renewal: Willow Ranch Allotment (3F LLC)

PREPARING OFFICE

Bureau of Land Management Mount Lewis Field Office 50 Bastian Road Battle Mountain, NV 89820



This page left blank intentionally.

A. Background

BLM Office: Mount Lewis Field Office - LLNVB01000

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: Authorization No. 2706080

Proposed Action Title/Type: 3F LLC Permit Renewal for the Willow Ranch Allotment

Location of Proposed Action: Willow Ranch Allotment and in the Mount Lewis Field Office, Lander County and Eureka County, Nevada.

Description of Proposed Action: The Proposed Action will extend the grazing permit for 10 years for the grazing permittee (3F LLC) within the Willow Ranch Allotment (51, 297 acres of BLM administered public land). The extension will be issued in accordance with Section 402(c)(2) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1752).

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name:

- Shoshone-Eureka Resource Management Plan (RMP), 1986 (as amended)
- NV CA 2015 Greater Sage-Grouse Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment (ARMPA)

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

- Page 9, Shoshone-Eureka RMP Livestock Grazing Objective #1: "Manage livestock use at 239,717 animal unit months (AUMs) (5-year average use) in the short-term and determine if such use can be maintained. In the long-term, manage livestock use at 262,500 AUMs."
- Page 2-24, ARMPA, MD LG 2: "The BLM will prioritize (1) the review of grazing permits/leases, in particular to determine if modification is necessary prior to renewal, and (2) the processing of grazing permits/leases in SFA followed by PHMAs outside of the SFA. In setting workload priorities, precedence will be given to existing permits/leases in these areas not meeting land health standards, with focus on those containing riparian areas, including wet meadows. The BLM may use other criteria for prioritization to respond to urgent natural resource concerns (e.g., fire) and legal obligations."

C. Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9(D)(11)(a): Issuance of livestock grazing permit/lease where the new grazing permit/lease is consistent with the use specified on the previous permit/lease such that (i) the same kind of livestock is grazed, (ii) the active use previously authorized is not exceeded, and (iii) grazing does not occur more than 14 days earlier or later than as specified on the previous permit/lease. This permit will be renewed

with the identical livestock kind, numbers, and season of use, as the existing permit. The number of AUMs will remain the same.

This CX is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The Mount Lewis Field Office reviewed the Proposed Action and none of the extraordinary circumstances in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2 apply.

D. Approval and Contact Information

Amanda Holmes	Amadaglashar	3/1/18
Name of Project Lead	Signature of Project Lead	Date
Christine Gabriel	Chritigalis	3.2.18
NEPA Coordinator	Signature of NEPA Courdinator	Date
Jon D. Sherve	Jacob Milled	3-2-2018
Authorized Official	Signalue of Authorized Official	Date
	For he of Cherry	

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:

Amanda Holmes, Range Management Specialist Mount Lewis Field Office, 50 Bastian Road, Battle Mountain, NV 89820 775.635.4139

	Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances: Will this project	Yes	No
1 Have significant adverse effects on public health or safety?			X
	Rationale: The Proposed Action is a continuation of existing grazing management within the Willow Ranch Allotment. No significant adverse effects on public health and safety are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action.		
2	Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		X
ac .	Rationale: No new disturbance is authorized under this CX, therefore, the Proposed Action will not cause significant impacts on any of the resources listed above.		
3	Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources?		X
	Rationale: There are no highly controversial environmental effects or unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources in the area. While there are members of the public who oppose some or all livestock grazing on public lands in general, none have expressed concerns about these specific allotments, or the effects of similar actions on similar allotments with any specificity.		
	Since the Proposed Action will be a continuation of current management, no significantly different environmental effects are anticipated.		
4	Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		Х
	Rationale: The Proposed Action will not have highly uncertain or potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks. The impacts of livestock grazing are well known and documented on public lands. The grazing permittee will continue using the existing grazing management system.		
5	Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?		X

	Rationale: The Proposed Action does not establish a precedent or represent a decision in principle for future actions with potentially significant effects, including any future permit renewals. Any permit renewal in accordance with Section 402(c)(2) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1752), will be considered and analyzed separately from the Proposed Action.	
6	Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?	X
ļ	Rationale: No significant cumulative impacts have been identified through this action. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions on-going in the Willow Ranch Allotment will not result in cumulatively significant impacts.	
7	Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the bureau or office?	X
	Rationale: The proposed action will have no significant impacts on NRHP eligible or listed properties since no new disturbance is authorized.	
8	Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?	X
	Rationale: The Proposed Action will not adversely impact threatened, endangered, candidate, and/or sensitive species (or their respective habitats) warranting protection under current BLM mandates.	
9	Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?	X
	Rationale: The Proposed Action does not violate any Federal, State, local, or tribal laws or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. The Proposed Action conforms to the Shoshone-Eureka RMP's policies for management of public lands in areas of jurisdiction and complies with applicable laws, rules, and regulations.	
10	Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).	X
	Rationale: No adverse or disproportionately high human health, environmental, economic, or other effects will occur specifically within low income or minority populations as a result of implementing the Proposed Action.	

11	Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites?	Х
	Rationale: The BLM Mount Lewis Field Office area archeologist reviewed the project. The Proposed Action will not limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands or adversely affect the integrity of such sacred sites.	
12	Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non- native species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species?	 X
	Rationale: Current grazing management would continue within the Willow Ranch Allotment and the effects of this continued management would not change. Therefore, this Proposed Action would not contribute to the introduction and/or spread of noxious weeds or non-native species known to occur in the area.	

All of the above questions must be answered negatively before the Categorical Exclusion may be approved. This checklist is taken from 516 DM 2, Appendix 2.

Reviewed By	Initials	Resource	Date
Cassie Ault	CMA	Lands and Realty	2/20/18
Madeline Van der Voort	nw	Archaeology	2/27/298
Madeline Van der Voort	mw	Paleontology	2/27/2018
Justin Ferris	JOP	Riparian/ Air/ Hydrology	2/26/2018
Dave Davis Justin Sa	· 2 / 5/15	T&E Species/ Wildlife	2/28/18
Shawna Richardson	SWR	Wild Horse and Burro	3/1/18
Amanda Holmes	dell	Livestock	3/11/18
Amanda Holmes	det	Soil	3/11/8
Amanda Holmes	MA	Vegetation	3/1/14
Molly Wright	BUS	Fire	2/28/18
Anna O'Brien	AO	Noxious Weeds	2-28-18



